UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,521	07/29/2003	Derek Mitsumori	0037-US-01	6045

83579 7590 02/22/2010		

LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC
c/o CPA Global
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402

EXAMINER
PATEL, CHANDRAHAS B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2464	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/22/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@cpaglobal.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 December 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,12-14,16,17,20-33,38,39,41 and 44-55* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,12-14,22-33,38,39,45-50 and 53* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *16, 17, 20, 21, 41, 44, 51, 52, 54, 55* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed 12/21/2009 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive. Applicant argues that Justice does not teach creating an authentication

record by parsing the information associated with the communication. However,

examiner disagrees. Justice teaches using phone number to get the information

associated with the customer. The information retrieved using phone number is parsed

to authorize the customer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

3.   Claims 16 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Sheu (USPN 7,099,301) in view of Justice et al. (USPN 6,516,056) and in further

view of Kwan et al. (US-PGPUB 2004/0255154).

Regarding claim 16 and 41, the references teach a system as discussed in

rejection of claim 51 and 52.

However, the references do not teach creating a RADIUS record.

Kwan teaches creating a RADIUS record **[Page 5, Paragraph 63]**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to create a RADIUS record so that user authentication functions

can be performed **[Page 3, Paragraph 33]**.

4.   Claims 17, 20, 21, 44, 51, 52, 54, 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Sheu (USPN 7,099,301) in view of Justice et al. (USPN

6,516,056).

Regarding claim 17, Sheu further teaches creating an authentication record is

performed by the enterprise gatekeeper **[Col. 9, lines 37-40, updating credit**

information will update authentication record].

Regarding claim 20, Justice teaches creating a billing record is performed by

the remote authentication server **[Col. 6, lines 1-14]**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to create a billing record at the remote authentication server to

avoid frauds **[Col. 6, lines 1-14]**.

Regarding claims 21 and 44, Justice teaches communicating from the remote

authentication server to a billing server, the billing call record **[Col. 5, lines 59-63,**

server 38 is gatekeeper for network shown in Fig. 1].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to communicate the authentication record from gatekeeper to a

remote authentication server so that fraud can be checked **[Col. 5, lines 63-67]**.

Regarding claim 51, Sheu teaches a computerized method for monitoring

communications in a packet switched network **[Col. 2, lines 34-48]**, the method

comprising: initiating a communication between a network endpoint associated with a

call mediator and at least a second network endpoint **[Col. 8, lines 53-60, Col. 9, lines**

1-7, 160 is associated with 150 as shown in Fig. 5 and described in Col. 7, lines 6-

9]; recording, at the call mediator, information associated with the communication **[Col. 8, lines 32-34]**; and upon termination of the communication, communicating, from the call mediator to an enterprise gatekeeper, the information associated with the communication **[Col. 9, lines 37-40]**.

However, Sheu does not teach creating an authentication record containing information associated with the communication by parsing the information associated with the communication; communicating the authentication record from the enterprise gatekeeper to a remote authentication server; and creating a billing call record by parsing the authentication record.

Justice teaches creating an authentication record containing information associated with the communication by parsing the information associated with the communication **[Fig. 11, information associated with phone number is used to create an authentication record]**; communicating the authentication record from the enterprise gatekeeper to a remote authentication server **[Col. 5, lines 59-63, server 38 is gatekeeper for network shown in Fig. 1]**; and creating a billing call record by parsing the authentication record **[Col. 4, lines 35-52]**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create a billing record and communicating authentication record to a authentication server so that fraudulent activity can be avoided **[Col. 5, lines 63-67]**

Regarding claim 52, Sheu teaches a system for monitoring communications in a packet switched network **[Col. 2, lines 34-48]**, the system comprising: a first network endpoint associated with a call mediator **[Fig. 2, 150a is associated with 160a as**

shown in Fig. 5]; at least a second network endpoint **[Fig. 2, 150b]**; and an enterprise

gatekeeper **[Fig. 2, 140a]**; wherein the first network endpoint initiates a communication

with the second network endpoint **[Col. 8, lines 53-60, Col. 9, lines 1-7]**; wherein the

call mediator records information associated with the communication **[Col. 8, lines 32-**

34]; and wherein upon termination of the communication, the call mediator

communicates to the enterprise gatekeeper, the information associated with the

communication **[Col. 9, lines 37-40]**.

However, Sheu does not teach the enterprise gatekeeper is programmed to

create an authentication record containing information associated with the

communication by parsing the information associated with the communication; the

enterprise gatekeeper is programmed to communicate the authentication record to a

remote authentication server; and the remote authentication server is programmed to

create a billing call record by parsing the authentication record.

Justice teaches the enterprise gatekeeper is programmed to create an

authentication record containing information associated with the communication by

parsing the information associated with the communication **[Fig. 11, information**

associated with phone number is used to create an authentication record]; the

enterprise gatekeeper is programmed to communicate the authentication record to a

remote authentication server **[Col. 5, lines 59-63, server 38 is gatekeeper for**

network shown in Fig. 1]; and the remote authentication server is programmed to

create a billing call record by parsing the authentication record **[Col. 4, lines 35-52]**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create a billing record and communicating authentication record to a authentication server so that fraudulent activity can be avoided **[Col. 5, lines 63-67]**.

Regarding claims 54 and 55, Sheu teaches a network identifier associated with a network endpoint, the network identifier specifying an enterprise customer network in which the network endpoint resides **[Col. 7, lines 12-24]**.

Allowable Subject Matter

5.   Claims 1-7, 12-14, 22-33, 38, 39, 45-50, 53 are allowed.

6.   The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claims 1, 27 and 50, the prior art fails to teach in combination translating the alphanumeric termination cause code into a numeric termination cause code, wherein translating the alphanumeric termination cause code is performed by the enterprise gatekeeper; creating an authentication record containing information associated with the communication by parsing the information associated with the communication; communicating the authentication record from the enterprise gatekeeper to a remote authentication server: and creating a billing call record by parsing the authentication record.

This taken with other limitations of dependent claims is considered novel and non-obvious.

Conclusion

7.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Chandrahas Patel whose telephone number is

(571)270-1211. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday

7:30 to 17:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on 571-272-3139. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ricky Ngo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2464

/Chandrahas Patel/
Examiner, Art Unit 2464